

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of November 17, 2009, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 21-24 and 27 were canceled previously. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-20, 25, 26, and 28-43 remain pending upon entry of the present paper.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-20, 25, 26, and 28-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. pub. no. 2008/0307040 to So (“So”). This rejection is traversed below.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, “receiving the requested information at the first mobile terminal responsive to the request.” Contrary to the contentions in the Office Action at page 3, So at paragraphs [0054] and [0056] fails to disclose such features. Instead, So at paragraph [0054] and [0056] merely describes a user entering a URL for a merchant web site into a URL entry field of a browser residing on a visitor’s remote device. Thus, at most, in So a user enters information about a resource on the user’s remote device, resulting in a flow of information from the user to the resource. Conversely, claim 1 recites features related to receiving requested information at a first mobile terminal responsive to a(n earlier) request. Claim 1 is distinguishable from So for at least these reasons.

Moreover, claim 1 recites “receiving a selection input from the first mobile terminal indicating the requested information to be transmitted to a second mobile terminal; and negotiating a communication connection between the first and the second mobile terminals responsive to the selection input, the negotiating including the first mobile terminal establishing a communication connection with the second mobile terminal; transferring the resource related information to the second mobile terminal over the communication connection.” So fails to disclose such features. Instead, So at paragraphs [0056]-[0072] describes how a first user can log onto a chatroom server, and select another (second) user to have a private conversation or chat. Such a process as described in So relies on the chatroom server facilitating communication between the first and second users. Conversely, claim 1 recites features related to negotiating a communication connection between first and second mobile terminals responsive to a selection input, the negotiating including the first mobile terminal establishing a communication

connection with the second mobile terminal and transferring resource related information to the second mobile terminal over the communication connection. Claim 1 is further distinguishable from So for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 25, 35, and 42 recite features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. Claims 25, 35, and 42 are distinguishable from So for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are distinguishable from So for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly. All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: November 20, 2009

By: /Mark E. Wilinski/  
Mark E. Wilinski  
Registration No. 63,230  
1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001